



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Germanique*, III, 626<sup>1</sup>) as identifying them with the three Beowulfine heroes. And he says Huchon rightly translates the passage,—which he does as follows:—“Aussi lui, (Hengest) ne recula-t'il pas devant la destinée, lorsque Hunlafing le mit en possession de la lumière de la guerre, de l'excellente épée, dont le tranchant était fameux parmi les Jutes (ou parmi les géants).” Imelmann himself translates line 1142 ‘Daher verweigerte er es dem Geschick nicht’ (= sah darin seinen Wink und gehorchte ihm).

I venture to suggest that Hunlaf, and not Hunlafing, is the proper name of Osulf and Guthlaf's brother, and that the reference in line 1143 is to a son of Hunlaf. This is in accordance with both the authorities quoted by Imelmann, and it would agree with the usual custom in Anglo-Saxon nomenclature, while it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a case where one brother's name ended in the same syllable as that of the others, but with the addition of *-ing*. It is no doubt unusual in *Beowulf* to mention a son of somebody without also mentioning his own name (Scyld Scöfing, etc.). We have Wælsing standing by itself at line 877, but Sigemund's name is given at line 875, so that is not a strong parallel:—but this seems a less difficulty than the other. If we may go by the order in the *Skjöldunga Saga*, Hunlaf would be the eldest brother, and probably he was dead before the attack in the *Finnsburg*. It is noteworthy that he, and not Guthlaf and Osulf, are mentioned in the Brut-version (above quoted) which also contains the name of Hengest. If, as is not unlikely, Hunlaf had been killed by the Frisians, lines 1148–1150 may well have reference to Guthlaf and Osulf's personal loss, and to their position as his natural avengers.

It is a great relief to find that the personage of line 1143 is a Dane, as it clears out of the road translations which must have been felt to be unsatisfactory. There must, however, still be some doubt as to the exact meaning of lines 1142 and 1145.

(1) ‘*woroldræden*’ is, I think, not ‘law of the world’ or ‘fate,’ but ‘custom of the world,’ looked at from the religious point of view (see the compounds of ‘*weorold*’ in Bosworth-Toller) so

that the line would mean ‘He did not run counter to the way of the world,’ i. e., he fell into temptation, as most people would have done under such circumstances (*swā*). This point of view is exemplified elsewhere in *Beowulf* (e. g., *woroldār*, 17) and seems more likely here than the too Oriental fatalism of ‘He did not resist his fate,’ or the too cynical ‘He took the hint.’

(2) What does line 1145 mean? Was *Hildeleoma* (I adopt Holthausen's suggestion that this is the proper name of a sword) originally a Danish or a Frisian sword? Had Hunlaf, or Hunlaf's son, captured it in a former contest, or had it been given to him at the dealings out of treasure? The last supposition seems most unlikely. Most probably the sword was a Danish one, and it may be that we must take line 1145 as meaning that it had already done good service in fight against the Eotens. The recollection of its past history would thus be likely to rouse Hengest.

But there is another alternative:—*ðæs* may here mean ‘hence,’ ‘and so’;—the line referring to the future. ‘And so its edges became well known among the Eotens’ (i. e., Hengest made good use of it). It may be objected that adverbial *ðæs* never begins a clause in *Beowulf*, but as the same may be said of demonstrative *ðæs*, this is not a serious objection. (The fact is that the position of *ðæs* in this line is unique in the poem.) The use of *swylce* in the next line seems to me rather to favor the view of a future interpretation (Schücking, *Satzverknüpfung*, pp. 84, 85, and cp. especially lines 1151–2, where the meaning is clearly ‘besides this’).

JOHN R. CLARK HALL.

Heworth, York, England.

#### WOODBERRY'S REVISED LIFE OF POE.

*The Life of Edgar Allan Poe, Personal and Literary, with his Chief Correspondence with Men of Letters.* By George E. Woodberry. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 383; viii + 481. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909.

Students of Poe everywhere will welcome the revised edition of Professor George E. Wood-

<sup>1</sup>“Rev. Herman.” in the *Disch. Litztg.* and Hoithausen, is a misprint.

berry's *Life of Poe*.<sup>1</sup> Since the first edition of this work made its appearance, now nearly a quarter of a century ago, several other lives of Poe have appeared—one of them, that of Prof. James A. Harrison, an excellent one—but even Professor Harrison's interesting and sympathetic life can hardly be said to have superseded Professor Woodberry's. Naturally, however, as the years passed, a good many new facts about Poe had been brought out; so that, as Professor Woodberry frankly puts it, the original edition had "become antiquated by its omissions." To collect and sift this new material was one of the chief tasks of the revision. And this task Professor Woodberry has performed with characteristic thoroughness and discrimination. To the contributions of others, however, he has added but few of his own,—fewer by far than his earlier biography, with its notable contributions, might have led us to expect. But this Professor Woodberry explains by the admission in his preface that he has made no personal investigation of his subject since writing the first edition.

The work has grown, in its revision, from a single volume of about 350 pages to two volumes containing over 850 pages. This increase in size comes about mainly through the incorporation into the text of a large number of letters and through the affixing of an appendix to each volume. A change in type also had something to do with the increase in size.

The appendixes—in all about 125 pages—comprise the most interesting parts of the new volumes. They contain, besides sundry "notes mainly on obscure or controverted points," a discussion of the homes of Poe in Richmond, the Poe-Duane letters (concerning the lost volume of the *Southern Literary Messenger*), Lowell's letters about Poe to Briggs, several hitherto unpublished letters of Poe (to Lucian Minor, Mathew Carey, A. B. Magruder, Neilson Poe, C. G. Percival, and Bayard Taylor), a restatement of the author's views on Poe's relations with Chivers, a note on "Griswold's world" (in which a good word is said for Griswold as anthologist), fragments of an unpublished tale of Poe's known as *The Light-house*, and a bibliography of the tales and poems, together with edi-

torial notes about them. Not the least valuable of these is the last-mentioned, in which Professor Woodberry presents, along with much other bibliographical material, his own views as to the time of composition of each of Poe's poems and tales. The fragment of *The Light-house*, recently found by Professor Woodberry among the Griswold mss., is brief, and of little interest other than historical. In the "notes on obscure or controverted points," some twenty or thirty points on which opinion still differs or which yet remain problematic are dealt with. In the first of these the question—still mooted, absurdly enough, in some quarters—of the time and place of Poe's birth, is discussed anew. Then comes a detailed account of the theatrical career of Poe's parents; then a discussion of Poe's alleged trip to Europe in 1827, a topic not touched on in the original work. Other topics dealt with are Poe's life at West Point (concerning which some reminiscences of a classmate, T. P. Jones, of Seguin, Texas, are given); Poe's *Mary* (now shown to have become the wife of a Mr. T. C. Leland—though her maiden name remains a mystery); Poe's indebtedness to E. T. A. Hoffmann; Poe's association with Mayne Reid; Poe's relations with Horace Greeley (showing that Poe once remonstrated with Greeley for charging him with unscrupulous neglect of financial obligations); Poe's embryonic affair of honor with John M. Daniel (a resumé of Mr. Whitty's account); Poe's use of opium; and, to conclude with, the authenticity of Griswold's sketch. Poe's indebtedness to Hoffmann, which Professor Palmer Cobb, in a recent Columbia University dissertation, endeavors to show to have been direct, Professor Woodberry holds was indirect, through Scott's article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* for July, 1827, for the most part; and he still insists, despite the researches of Professor Cobb and of Professor Gruener, of Harvard, that Poe knew little or no German. On the subject of Poe's use of opium, Professor Woodberry, after giving the testimony of others, expresses this opinion of his own (II, p. 430): "I incline to the view that Poe began the use of drugs in Baltimore, that his periods of abstinence from liquor were periods of at least moderate indulgence in opium, and that in 1846-47 under the advice of his physicians he abandoned the habit;

<sup>1</sup> First published in Boston in 1885.

that his physical state and mode of life in 1847 are connected with this attempt, and his supposed success in it was the ground of his many statements that the 'physical cause' of his fits of intemperance had ceased and the reiterated expressions of the excellence of his health; and that his begging for laudanum after his sprees was a sign of lapsing into an older habit, which he did not take with him to Richmond." In his note on Griswold and Poe, Professor Woodberry comes strongly to the defence of Griswold. The concluding paragraph of his note sufficiently indicates the attitude that he takes (II, p. 454): "To Griswold's memoir no reply, so far as I know, was made by Poe's friends, except in so far as Burr's article (1852) was a plea in mitigation of judgment, and, long afterwards, Clarke's article (1868) quoted, with cordial endorsement, the testimony of Willis, and added a few words of the writer's own. On the other hand, Thompson, Thomas, and Kennedy, and Mrs. Lewis remained on friendly terms with Griswold; English, Briggs, and Wallace sustained him" [which we must interject, was the most natural thing conceivable, since each was an avowed enemy of Poe], "Redfield and Leland defended him, and Stoddard wrote often and much to substantiate his statements. It is also just to add that the characterization that Griswold gave, in substance though not in feeling, was the same as that which uniformly prevailed in tradition in the best-informed literary circles in this country. The rebirth of Poe's reputation took place in writers of the next generation." In most of what he says here, Professor Woodberry is doubtless right. It must be pretty clear that Griswold has done too heavy a penance for his betrayal of the trust reposed in him as Poe's literary executor. For, in truth, Griswold's unfairness to Poe came less in specific charges against Poe, than in the animus with which these charges were presented and in the omission of much that might have been urged in explanation and extenuation of these charges. But Professor Woodberry overshoots the mark when he expresses the opinion that but two or three replies to Griswold's memoir were made. Because of the memorable notice in the *Tribune*, Griswold, we are told, "was hotly as-

sailed on all sides."<sup>2</sup> But he was also called to account for what he wrote in the memoir proper, and not only by Clarke and Burr, but also by Mrs. Whitman in her "Edgar Poe and his Critics"; by W. J. Pabodie in a letter of June 2, 1852, to the *New York Tribune* and in a private letter to Griswold of June 11, 1852 (*Virginia Poe*, xvii, pp. 408 f., 412 f.); by J. Wood Davidson (in *Russell's Magazine*, November, 1857, I, pp. 170 f.); and by Wilmer (in *The Press Gang*, Philadelphia, 1859, p. 385); and Ingram also mentions vindictory articles by Mr. Moy Thomas and Mayne Reid, which I have not seen.

Most of the letters now first incorporated into the text had been published before, either by Professor Harrison or by Professor Woodberry himself, but a half-dozen or more appear now for the first time, among them two letters to Kennedy, dated December 31, 1840, and June, 1841, (I, pp. 266 f., 280 f.); one to Thomas, August 27, 1847, concerning the government position which he had endeavored to secure for Poe, (I, pp. 335-7); and one to Bowen and Gossler, editors of a Columbia (Pa.) paper, a strange letter, of January 18, 1844, concerning literary conditions in New York at that time (II, pp. 81-7). Among topics that are new or that are treated at greater length than in the old edition are these: Poe's relations to the Allans (I, pp. 54, 68, 73 f., 94 f.); his life in Baltimore between 1831 and 1835, in particular his love-making with a cousin, Miss Herring (concerning whom new information has been furnished by Miss A. F. Poe), and the more desperate love-affair with his Baltimore *Mary* (Professor Woodberry accepting *in toto* the story of "Poe's Mary" printed in *Harper's Monthly* a number of years ago); the tradition of Poe's flirtation in Richmond with Miss Eliza White, and the suggestion that this had something to do with Poe's "hasty marriage to Virginia" (I, p. 185); the genesis and development of *The Raven* (II, pp. 111 f.); the poet's unhappy experiences in Philadelphia in the summer of 1849 (II, pp. 311 f.); and, finally, his career in Richmond during his last two visits there in

<sup>2</sup>I quote the words of R. H. Stoddard, whom Mr. Woodberry mentions among Griswold's staunchest supporters.

the summers of 1848 and 1849 (II, pp. 317-342). Concerning Poe's relations with the Allans, Professor Woodberry now holds, with Professor Harrison, that Mr. Allan never contemplated making Poe his heir. He also inclines to credit the tradition that the rupture between the two grew out of some piece of misconduct on Poe's part, the facts of which are well known to certain of the descendants of Mr. Allan, but have not been disclosed to the public (I, pp. 102-3, note). The theory of the composition of *The Raven* to which Professor Woodberry now gives his endorsement, is this: the true germ of the poem is to be found in Poe's review of *Barnaby Rudge* in 1842 (a view already advanced by Ingram), and the poem may have been begun in this year; one draft of it had been completed by the summer of 1843; the poem was revised and completed in the autumn or early winter of 1844-45 after Poe had moved to 15 Amity Street. It will thus be seen that Professor Woodberry accepts not only the accounts of Rosenbach, Mrs. Brennan, and Du Solle, but also that of W. E. Griffis, which in the original edition (p. 221, note) he characterized as "highly improbable." Concerning the authenticity of the half-dozen poems variously attributed to Poe<sup>3</sup> yet not regularly included in the editions of his works, Professor Woodberry disdains to give an opinion—he ignores them both in the body of his text and in the bibliography of the poems; he does pass judgment, however, on the genuineness of a number of translations which appeared in the *New Mirror* above the signature of "E. P."<sup>4</sup> An interesting conjecture offered now for the first time is that the poem entitled *Ballad* in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for August, 1835, and signed "Sidney," was the first draft of *Bridal Ballad*.

There are but few points on which the biographer has shifted ground since the appearance of his first edition. He still adheres, for instance, to the tradition that Poe was privately wedded to

Virginia Clemm in Baltimore a year before their public marriage in Richmond,—indeed, he states this as a fact in his index; he repeats (I, p. 82) his vague but tantalizing assertion that *The Valley of Unrest*, *Israfel*, and *The City of the Sea* were "developed from slight Oriental suggestions"; and he reiterates (II, p. 259) the statement that the parallelism between *The Bells* and a passage in Châteaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* "is not likely to be a fortuitous coincidence."<sup>5</sup> He has changed front, however, with reference to Poe's friendship for Mrs. Stanard. In his earlier edition (p. 23) he had said, in agreement with other biographers, that Mrs. Stanard was for a short time Poe's "confidante and friend," and that after her death he "for a long while . . . haunted her grave by night." In the present edition (I, p. 29) he maintains that Poe saw Mrs. Stanard only once, and that "the tale that he haunted her grave by night, with all its later Poesque atmosphere, must be dismissed." The grounds for this reversal of opinion will not readily appear to any except these who are familiar with Mrs. Weiss's deliverance on the point. Mrs. Weiss says (in her *The Home Life of Poe*, p. 39) that the cemetery in which Mrs. Stanard was buried was surrounded by high walls and that the gates of the cemetery were securely locked by night; furthermore, that the discipline of the Allan household was very strict; so that, if she be correct in these particulars, the midnight excursions which Poe is traditionally reported to have made, must have been impossible. Another shift is made with reference to the poet's relations with Mrs. Shelton in 1848. In the earlier edition (p. 311) Poe's message to Mrs. Whitman from Richmond, "I was about to enter on a course which would have borne me far, far away, from you, sweet, sweet Helen," was interpreted as referring to "his intention of offering his hand to Mrs. Shelton." In the new edition this explanation is omitted, Professor Woodberry inclining apparently to the view proposed by Mr. Whitty, that Poe had reference to the duel which he expected to fight with John M. Daniel. But reference to Professor J. A. Harrison's recent edition

<sup>3</sup> *The Mammoth Squash*, *The Fire Legend*, *The Magician*, *The Skeleton Hand*, the *Hymn in Honor of Harmodius and Aristogeiton*, the "Lavante" satire, and the two skits to his cousin Elizabeth.

<sup>4</sup> These Professor Woodberry denies to Poe, suggesting at the same time that they were "from the pen of Emily Perceval" (II, p. 103, note).

<sup>5</sup> Professor Woodberry's insistence upon this point seems to me to be out of keeping with his usual conservatism in such matters.

of Poe's letters to Mrs. Whitman (*Last Letters of Edgar Allan Poe to Sarah Helen Whitman*, New York, 1909, p. 13) shows that Poe's letter on which the whole question had turned had been garbled in the printed texts just at the crucial point, and that instead of the words "was about to enter on a course" etc., we actually have these words: "was about to depart on a tour and an enterprise which would have changed my very nature—fearfully altered my very soul—steeped me in a stern, cold, and debasing, although brilliant gigantic ambition—and borne me 'far, far away' from you,"—words which assuredly cannot refer to a projected duel. In my judgment, it refers, as Professor Woodberry first conjectured, to his projected marriage to Mrs. Shelton, the "gigantic ambition" alluded to being perhaps the establishment of a magazine with the aid of her money. Noteworthy also is the omission of sundry depreciatory references to Poe which appeared in the former edition,—among them the statements as to the untrustworthiness of Poe's word (pp. 31 and 222-3), the comment on his lack of humor (p. 85), the condemnatory judgment on the last stanza of *Bridal Ballad* (pp. 94-5), and the statement as to Poe's proneness to paraphrase from others (p. 97). But more noteworthy still is the comment made in the first volume of the new edition (p. 123), that "the question of Poe's physique is fundamental in his biography,"—a concession to Robertson, Lauvrière, and other friends of Poe.

Errors of statement are few for a work in which such a vast amount of detail is collected. The assertion (II, p. 259) that Poe was "in early years under considerable obligations" to Châteaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* must be due to a confounding of this work with Châteaubriand's *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, which Professor Woodberry claims was the source of the line "Isola d'oro!—Fior di Levante!" embodied by Poe in his *Al Aaraaf* and his *Sonnet to Zante*. And surely it is too much to say that this slight indebtedness involves "considerable obligations." Another error appears in a note in the appendix to the first volume, p. 377. It is asserted here that "the date of the arrival of Mrs. Clemm and Virginia in Richmond [to make their home there] was Oct. 1, 1836"; and in support of this the

letter of Mrs. Clemm to William Poe of date October 7, 1836, is cited. In reality, Mrs. Clemm and her daughter had moved to Richmond almost a year before this, probably in the autumn of 1835 when Poe returned to Richmond to resume his place on the *Messenger*. This is established by Poe's letter of January 12, 1836, in which it appears that Mrs. Clemm was then living in Richmond; other letters bearing on the point are Mrs. Clemm's of February 21 and April 12, 1836. The letter to William Poe which Professor Woodberry unhappily lays hold of in this connection perhaps has reference merely to Mrs. Clemm's return from a visit to Baltimore,—either that, or (as is more probable) the date of the letter is erroneously given as 1836 instead of 1835. Contradictory is the statement (I, p. 198): "He is to be credited, too, with a translation and digest of Lemonnier's *Natural History* . . . ; but there is no indication that he had any part in this work beyond his own statement, in reviewing it, that he spoke 'from personal knowledge, and the closest inspection and collation.'" The first edition (p. 113) avoided the difficulty by reading, "He has been credited" etc. Erroneous also is the statement (II, p. 163) that Poe's 1845 volume of poems, *The Raven and Other Poems*, was issued "Just at the close of the year, apparently on December 31." It must have appeared a month or more before this; for Poe mentioned it in *The Broadway Journal* of November 22 as being among the books "on hand for notice";<sup>6</sup> and in the same journal for December 13 he reprinted a review of it from the *Brook Farm Phalanx* of December 6. Another correction to be made is in the date of *Siope*. This tale was not published "in the fall of 1838," as is said in I, p. 198, but in the fall of 1837. The *Baltimore Book*, in which it came out, was reviewed in the *Baltimore Monument* for December 2, 1837 (p. 68), the contents of the volume being described there at length. Erroneous, too, are the dates given to *Fifty Suggestions*, the lines *To — — —* (to Mrs. Shew), and the review of Lowell's *Fable for Critics*, on pp. 257, 268, and 296, respectively,

<sup>6</sup> In the same number of the *Broadway Journal*, Wiley and Putnam advertised the volume for sale, offering it at 31 cents.

of the same volume. Worth noting, also, is the slip made in asserting (II, p. 412) that the poem *Alone*, which first appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* for September, 1875, "was copied into a Baltimore album March 17, 1829." On the facsimile of the poem as printed in *Scribner's*, there are words to that effect, but more than ten years ago Professor Woodberry, in his edition of Poe's poems (in collaboration with the poet Stedman<sup>7</sup>) had expressed doubt as to the authenticity of these words; and Mr. E. L. Didier, who sent the facsimile to the editors of *Scribner's*, has since admitted<sup>8</sup> that these words were not originally in the manuscript of the poem, but were supplied by himself. To the bibliography of the tales and poems (II, pp. 400 f.) the following additions should be made: under *Morella* (p. 400), *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine* for November, 1839; under *The Fall of the House of Usher* (p. 402), Griswold's *Prose Writers of America*, first three editions (see Poe's letter to Griswold of February 24, 1845, "Virginia Poe," XVII, p. 201); under *To Science* (p. 412), *Graham's Magazine* for June, 1841; under *Scenes from Politian* (p. 414), the excerpt of that play printed by Ingram in an edition of Poe's poems, New York, no date, pp. 96 f., and the briefer extracts incorporated in his article on "Politian" in *The Southern Magazine*, XVII, pp. 588 f.; under *Ulalume* (p. 416), *The Literary World* of March 3, 1849 (see Poe's letters of February 16 and March 8, 1849, to E. A. Duyckinck, then one of the editors of *The Literary World*); under the sonnet *To My Mother* (p. 416), *The Leaflets of Memory* for 1850 (p. 68); and under *The Raven* and *The Conqueror Worm* (both on p. 415), the ninth edition of Griswold's *The Poets and Poetry of America* (Philadelphia, 1848).<sup>9</sup> Under *To —* ("I heed not that my earthly lot") (p. 412) the date 1845 should be deleted, since this poem did not appear in the volume of poems brought out in that year.

<sup>7</sup> See *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Chicago, 1894-6, x, p. 237.

<sup>8</sup> In his *The Poe Cult and Other Essays*, New York, 1909, p. 270.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also my article in *The Nation* of December 30, 1909 (p. 647 f.), in which I give a list of Poe's publications in *The Flag of Our Union* for 1849.

There are also some errors traceable to careless transcribing. For example, the title of the volume of poems published in 1845, *The Raven and Other Poems*, is twice printed on p. 163 of vol. II with a comma after the second word; on the same page, in the list of contents of this volume, *The Valley of Unrest* and *The City in the Sea* are printed without the initial "The," *The Lake = To —* is printed "The Lake = To —," and two slight errors are made in capitalization. Again in the list of the *Tales* published in the same year (see II, p. 148, note), *A Descent into the Maelstrom* is printed as "The Descent into the Maelstrom," and *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* as "The Murders of the Rue Morgue." The title of "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" is similarly misprinted in a footnote on p. 39, vol. II; and in the same note (as also on p. 404), the publisher of the edition of Poe's tales in 1843 is erroneously given as George B. Zieber; the full title-page of this rare volume—a copy of which is to be found in the Library of Congress—is as follows: *The | Prose Romances of Edgar A. Poe, | Author of "The Gold Bug," "Arthur Gordon Pym," "Tales | of the Grotesque and Arabesque," | Etc. Etc. Etc. | Uniform Serial Edition. | Each Number Complete in Itself. | No. 1. | Containing the | Murders in the Rue Morgue, and the | Man That was Used Up. | Philadelphia: | Published by William H. Graham, | No. 98 Chestnut Street. | 1843. | Price 12 1/2 cents.* Other instances of careless transcribing are to be found in the reproduction of certain of the letters to John Pendleton Kennedy, the originals of which are preserved in the Peabody Library at Baltimore. Collation of Professor Woodberry's text with the originals brings out a number of unimportant errors in punctuation and paragraphing, and also in one case—in the letter of June, 1841, printed in I, pp. 280-282—several errors in phrasing. These are as follows: in the second line, *desire* for *design*; in the fifth line, *send* for *say*; in the eighteenth line on p. 281, *vigorous* for *rigorous*.

Mere typographical errors are more abundant than we should expect in a publication from the "Riverside Press." In the first volume I have detected the following: *Burk* for *Burke* (pp. 25, 29), *Gowan's* for *Gowans's* (p. 257), *xviii* for *xvii*

in the footnote on p. 354, and 141 for 146 on p. 377, l. 23. In the second volume, such errors are more numerous. To be noted first of all are sundry slips in the spelling of proper names. The name of John M. Daniel is spelled *Daniels* no less than seven times (pp. 273, 425, etc.); *Ferguson* appears for *Fergusson* (pp. 443, 463); *Francis* for *Frances* (p. 178); *Lee* for *Lea* (p. 402); *Sargeant* for *Sargent* (pp. 415, 416); *F. W. White* for *T. W. White* (p. 471); *Matthew* for *Mathew* (p. 475); *Stannard* for *Stanard* (p. 478). Other errors are: 1839 for 1838 (p. 401, l. 13); 20 for 21 (p. 404, l. 21); *saw* for *see* (p. 412, l. 21); 1845 for 1835 (p. 414, l. 6); "To ——" for "To ———" (p. 416, l. 9); *challenge* misspelled (p. 444, l. 33); "Lemonnier" in the index (p. 466) out of alphabetical order; "*The Haunted Chamber* for *The Haunted Palace*," under "Longfellow" (p. 466); *Outes* for *Outis* (p. 469); *Brigg's* for *Briggs's* (p. 473). I have also stumbled upon slight errors or omissions in the page references in the index under "Clarke, Thomas C.," "Mary," "Mystification," "Poe, Rosalie P.," "Wallace, William," and "White, Eliza." But aside from these errors, the mechanical work of the two volumes is thoroughly satisfactory. The index is several times fuller than the index of the first edition. There is also improvement in type, in paper, and in binding. And the photographs, engravings, and facsimiles, with which both volumes are liberally supplied, are done most admirably.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

*The University of Texas.*

## THE ROMANTIC SCHOOL IN GERMANY.

WERNÆR, ROBERT M., Ph. D.: *Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Co., 1910. xv + 373 pp.

Dr. Wernær has the distinction of having written the first complete English discussion of the German Romantic School. He has studied the sources carefully and has sought, not only to

give the salient features of the School's activities, but to interpret Romanticism as a literary phenomenon in its broader relations to the human spirit. His study is a personal study, written by a man filled with the greatness of the men with whom he has to deal and yet not blinded by their faults; but his interpretation remains always intensely subjective and has all the faults and virtues of such subjectivity.

For him Romanticism is neither a return to the past nor to nature but is a reaction of "Love" against the "Legal" attitude of mind which threatens to shut out from the world the vision of "sweetness and light." From this "Love" all romantic activity proceeded; on the basis of this "Love" all romantic attitudes must be interpreted. The great failure of the book is that it leaves the reader with the suspicion that much of this "Love" proceeds not directly from the School, but from Dr. Wernær's undeniably poetic interpretation of the Romantic mood and that the glamor within him is reflected in the pages of his work. Instead of keeping a middle course between Haym and Ricarda Huch as the program of his preface indicated, he has substituted for the latter's subjectivity and her theory of the male and female elements in the spirit of the Romantic School and of Goethe, a new theory and a new subjectivity.

For this reason the book will not be entirely clear to the average reader. He will leave it, no doubt, with a keen sense of appreciation of the School and a firm belief in his own Romanticism, but he will not have had a critical survey of the whole. In a way, the book is not elementary enough. It does not contain enough of the bare Grubbiest facts set forth as such. For the specialist, the abandonment of the literary-historical point of departure and the assumption of a new standard offers food for thought. The specialist will not, perhaps, abandon his cherished historical point of view without a struggle, if he abandon it at all, but he must recognize that in this work a definite stand is taken and a real interpretative attempt is made.

There can be no question that the author understands the Romantic School, in spite of a certain naive wonder at it that crops out from time to time. His interpretation of the main problems of